

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Serial No.	: <b>09/823,103</b>	Confirmation No.	: <b>8391</b>
Filing Date	: <b>March 30, 2001</b>	Art Unit	: <b>2128</b>
Inventor	: <b>Vassil Iordanov</b>	Examiner	: <b>Hugh M. Jones</b>
Customer No.	: <b>22469</b>	Docket No.	: <b>2028068-0021</b>
Title:	: <b>METHOD OF AND SYSTEM FOR PROVIDING METACOGNITIVE PROCESSING FOR SIMULATING COGNITIVE TASKS</b>		

---

**CORRESPONDENCE**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This Correspondence is further to the Correspondence filed on July 13, 2007, in which it was noted that a notification of withdrawal of the holding of “non-responsive” for the Amendment and Response filed on April 6, 2007 has not been received.

Since the filing of the July 13, 2007 Correspondence, Applicants, through their attorneys, have taken the following actions:

July 30, 2007: A voicemail message was left for Examiner Hugh Jones stating that a notification that the holding of “non-responsive amendment” was withdrawn has not been received, and requesting confirmation that the Application was in order and proceeding properly.

August 27, 2007: A telephone call was placed to Examiner Kamini Shah regarding not having received notification that the holding of “non-responsive amendment” was withdrawn. Examiner Shah stated she would discuss the matter with Examiner Jones.

September 7, 2007: A voicemail message was left for Examiner Shah following up on the August 27, 2007 telephone conversation, as notification that the holding of “non-responsive amendment” was withdrawn was still not received.

Date unknown, but approximately September 10, 2007: Examiner Jones called and stated he would issue a written summary providing that the holding of "non-responsiveness" is withdrawn.

To date notification has not been received and PAIR does not show that notification has been mailed.

As noted in the Correspondence filed on July 13, 2007, Examiner Jones stated that "there is no action for Applicants' to take at this time on the application and that he will proceed on Applicants' previously filed Amendment". This was in response to an inquiry as to whether Applicants had to file a response to the notice of a non-responsive amendment.

Again, Applicants seek confirmation from the Patent Office that there are no outstanding actions to which Applicants must respond. In the event that the Patent Office determines that a formal response to the Notice of Non-responsive Amendment is required, contrary to the previous instructions provided, kindly consider this Correspondence together with the Correspondence filed on July 13, 2007 as such a response. Waiver of any resulting extension of time fees is respectfully requested based on the circumstances described herein and in the July 13, 2007 Correspondence.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee related to this Correspondence, including any extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 13-3405.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCHNADER HARRISON SEGAL & LEWIS LLP

Date: October 1, 2007 By: Joan T. Kluger  
Joan T. Kluger  
Reg. No. 38,940  
1600 Market Street, Suite 3600  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Tel: (215) 751-2357  
Fax: (215) 751-2205  
e-mail: jkluger@schnader.com  
Attorneys for Applicants